REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 have been amended hereby. Claims 1 and 7 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Independent Claims 1 and 7 have been amended in part to clarify that the "operating environments" are associated with software tasks (e.g., image or sound generation processing).

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to clarify that the "selectively connect" is performed under the control of the management processor.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1 and 7, and the claims depending therefrom, are clear and definite in their recitation of the present invention and meet all requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,886,537 ("*Macias*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,175,837 ("*Arnold*"), as set forth in the Office Action at paragraphs 7-14; Claims 4 and 5 were rejected as being obvious over *Macias* in view of *Arnold* and U.S. Patent No. 5,926,583 ("*Iwase*"), as set forth in the Office Action in paragraphs 16-21; Claim 7 was rejected as being obvious over *Macias* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,876,643 ("*McNeill*"), as set forth in the Office Action in paragraphs 23-26; Claims 8 and 9 were rejected as being obvious over *Macias* in view of *McNeill* and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083111 ("*Row*"), as set forth in the Office Action in paragraphs 28-32; and Claims 10 and 11 were rejected as being obvious over *Macias* in view

of *McNeill*, *Row*, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200249 ("*Gorgone*"), as set forth in the Office Action in paragraphs 34-37.

Applicants respectfully traverse the aforementioned rejections for the following reasons.

Salient features of the present invention are a signal processing device (e.g., 10 in Fig. 1) including a management processor (e.g., 101 in Fig. 1) for estimating a load of the entire processing and the kind of processing to be performed, and for determining based on the estimation a number of component-processors (e.g., 103A-D in Fig. 1) to operate and their operating environments. See paragraph [0067] of the published application, for example.

In contrast, in *Macias* each SDP individually decides whether it should operate in D-mode or in C-mode. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Macias* fails to teach or suggest "the management processor estimates a type of processing and a load of the entire processing, and determines based on the estimation a number of component-processors to operate, and changes the operating environment of each of the component-processors," as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 7. As described in lines 42-44 of column 2 of *Macias*, the controller of PLDs is itself composed of PLDs, and the controller does not estimate the amount of processing.

None of the other cited references cure the deficiencies of *Macias*.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1 and 7, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over the cited references, alone or in any possible combination.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Pedro C. Fernandez/
Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6311
Fax: (212) 940-8986
Docket No.: SCES 20.808 (100809-00230)
PCF:fd